

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 KURT ANGELONE,
12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 MICHAEL FURST, *et al*,
15 Defendants.
16

Case No. C07-5538RJB-KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
THIRD MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME

17 This matter has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
18 636(b)(1), Local Rules MJR 3 and 4, and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The case is
19 before the Court on plaintiff's filing of a third motion for an extension of time (Dkt. #132) for filing a
20 response to defendants' motion to dismiss. (Dkt. #103). After reviewing plaintiff's motion and the
21 balance of the record, the Court finds and orders as follows:

22 This is the third time plaintiff has requested an extension of time in which to respond to
23 defendants' motion to dismiss. The Court granted plaintiff's first motion for an extension of time on
24 October 28, 2008. (Dkt. #105, #110). Although the Court was disinclined to grant plaintiff's second
25 motion for an extension of time, because the purported reasons therefore put forth by plaintiff did not
26 warrant the granting of such a request, it nevertheless gave an additional 20 days in which to file his
27 response because the previously extended deadline already had passed. (Dkt. #114, #120).

28 Plaintiff's response thus was due on December 10, 2008, resulting in plaintiff being provided with

1 an additional 31 days in which to file his response. In addition, plaintiff was warned that he would be
2 granted no further extensions of time in which to do so. The Court received two responses from plaintiff
3 to defendants' motion for summary judgment on November 17, 2008 (Dkt. #119), and December 9, 2008
4 (Dkt. #127). Plaintiff points out in his current motion for an extension of time that those responses only
5 concerned one of the named defendants.

6 Plaintiff, however, does not explain why he also could not have responded with respect to any of
7 the other defendants at the same time. Nor does plaintiff provide any other relevant or valid bases for the
8 Court to re-consider its prior warning that he would not be granted any further extensions. Accordingly,
9 the Court declines to do so. For all of the foregoing reasons, therefore, plaintiff's third motion for an
10 extension of time (Dkt. #132), hereby is DENIED.

11 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff and counsel for defendants.

12 DATED this 26th day of January 2009.

13
14
15 

16 Karen L. Strombom
17 United States Magistrate Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28